



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,166	03/04/2002	Vladimir Minenko	1454.1221	9181
21171	7590	11/16/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			NGUYEN, LE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/070,166

Applicant(s)

MINENKO ET AL.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 March 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference character(s) mentioned in the description: 513. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

2. The Specification is objected to because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 102 and 103 of fig. 1 as well as 606 of fig. 6. Correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: sections 0014-0015 seem to be a repetition of sections 0012-0013. Deletions of the repetitive sections are required.

4. Content of Specification:

Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f).  
A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.

Brief descriptions of figures 1-3 appear to be missing.

***Claim Objections***

5. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 1 of claim 22, "wherein the computer is a mobile" appears to contain grammatical errors. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 11-17, 22-25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dowling in view of Want et al. ("Want").

As per claim 11, Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer (Abstract; col. 9, line 56 through col. 10, line 46; col. 11, line 30 through col. 12, line 11) comprising ascertaining a location of the computer (col. 10, lines 43-44; col. 11, lines 34-35), ascertaining bookmarks corresponding to the location (col. 10, lines 15-21 and 40-46; col. 11, line 30 through col. 12, line 7), displaying the

Art Unit: 2174

bookmarks (col. 10, lines 19-21; col. 11, lines 34-42) and storing the bookmarks and location information (col. 10, lines 15-21 and 35-36; col. 12, lines 7-11 and lines 4-5; col. 11, lines 1-14; *bookmarks such as restaurant bookmarks and location data are stored wherein the bookmarks are stored with other related information*). Dowling does not explicitly disclose storing the bookmarks with location information. Want teaches storing bookmarks with location information (col. 2, lines 24-27 and 41-46; *bookmarks allow users the ability to reference a document on the World-Wide Web or other hypermedia system via a URL and Want's bookmarks allow user the ability to reference a Web page containing location specific information*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Want's teaching of storing bookmarks with location information to Dowling's teaching of storing bookmarks and location information so that information relating to a specific location may be obtained and referenced.

As per claim 12, the modified Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer wherein the bookmarks are used to access data in a network (Want: col. 2, lines 41-46).

As per claims 13 and 22, the modified Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer wherein the network is the Internet (Want: col. 2, lines 24-27 and 41-46).

As per claim 14, the modified Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer wherein the computer is a mobile computer (Want: col. 2, lines 15-17).

As per claims 15 and 23, the modified Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer wherein the location of the computer is ascertained using a GPS sensor (Want: col. 2, lines 19-21).

As per claims 16 and 24, the modified Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer wherein bookmarks, i.e. URLs used to reference a document on the World-Wide Web, corresponding to the location are determined by a prescribed distance between the information linked to the bookmark and the location (Dowling: col. 10, lines 49-61; *consistent with the specification, Dowling's compiled menu/bookmark(s) corresponding to the location of the computer is determined as a result of the information linked to the bookmark being at a prescribed distance from the location of the computer*).

As per claims 17 and 25, the modified Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer wherein resources of the computer are moved to a static system (Dowling: col. 10, lines 24-61; *a static system wherein search query result(s) are transmitted to the mobile system via an interface*).

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 11 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claims 18-20, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dowling in view of Want et al. ("Want") as applied to claim 11, and further in view of Hollenberg.

As per claims 18 and 26, although the modified Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer wherein additional filters are

used to filter a search query (Dowling: col. 13, lines 7-9), Dowling does not explicitly disclose the additional filter to be a time information type. Hollenberg teaches a method for displaying and book marking location-dependent information wherein time related filters are used (col. 10, lines 32-36; *described is a mobile on-line system in which geographically ordered information sources are advanced from the user's current location and provide a selection of current location-dependent events to users*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Hollenberg's teaching of time-related filtering to the modified Dowling's teaching of various additional filters in order to provide users with an additional implementation preference.

Claims 19 and 27 are individually similar in scope to claim 11 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, the modified Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer wherein the bookmarks are stored automatically (Dowling: col. 10, lines 59-61).

9. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dowling in view of Want et al. ("Want") as applied to claim 11, and further in view of Hollenberg.

As per claim 21, although the modified Dowling teaches a method for displaying location-dependent bookmarks on a computer wherein the bookmarks are stored automatically (Dowling: col. 10, lines 59-61), Dowling does not explicitly disclose the bookmarks being stored manually. Official Notice is taken that storing bookmarks manually via browsers (e.g. Netscape) is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include storing bookmarks manually to the modified Dowling's teaching of storing bookmarks automatically given that the function of bookmarks is to provide a list of links for referencing and manually storing bookmarks allows users greater flexibility, control and overall customization capabilities in compiling the list to reflect what users consider to be frequently visited links.

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sheynblat et al. (US 6,677,894 B2) teach a method and apparatus for providing location-based information via a computer network.

Schaphorst (5,767,795) teaches GPS-based information system for vehicles

Titmuss et al. (6,397,040 B1) teach a telecommunications apparatus and method.

Gersham et al. (6,356,905 B1) teach a system, method and article of manufacture for mobile communication utilizing an interface support framework.

Havinis et al. (6,295,454 B1) teach a system and method for providing chronicled location information for terminal-based position calculation.



Cumbers (6,783,459 B2) teach a passive biometric customer identification and tracking system.

***Inquires***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN  
Patent Examiner  
November 1, 2004

  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100